

**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE**

February 20, 2019 at 1:00 p.m.
MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan
MINUTES

****Frequently Used Acronyms Attached**

Members Present:

Bill McEntee, CRA – Chair
Jonathan Start, MTPA/KATS

Bob Slattery, MML, via Telephone
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS

Support Staff Present:

Niles Annelin, MDOT
Gil Chesbro, MDOT
Cheryl Granger, DTMB/CSS
Gloria Strong, MDOT

Roger Belknap, MDOT
Tim Colling, LTAP/MTU, via Telephone
Dave Jennett, MDOT
Mike Toth, MDOT

Members Absent:

Jennifer Tubbs, MTA

Public Present:

Douglas Adelman, MDOT
Rachel Jones, RCOC

Jill Bauer, ROWE PSC
Aaron Verhelle, RCOC

1. Welcome – Call-to-Order – Introductions:

The meeting was called-to-order at 1:07 p.m. Everyone was introduced and welcomed to the meeting.

2. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:

None

3. Consent Agenda:

3.1. – Approval of January 23, 2019 Data Committee Meeting Minutes - Action Item (Attachment 1)

Motion: J. Start made a motion to approve the January 23, 2019 meeting minutes; R. Slattery seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

3.2. – TAMC Budget Update (Attachment 2)

An updated financial report (02/14/2019) was provided to the committee.

4. Presentations – TAMC Lead Analyst – G. Chesbro:

4.1. - 2018 PASER Data Analysis, Quality Review and Forecast

G. Chesbro presented data analysis of city and villages for non-construction revenues to non-trunkline for federal aid. There is a large difference in revenues from the last data analysis – one modal year to the next modal year.

The 2017 Report that shows the Forecast of Pavement Condition for 2017-2027 – all Paved Federal Aid Roads show an increase in the percent poor and a decrease in percent good and fair. For the 2018 report that shows the Forecast of Pavement Condition 2019-2029 – all Paved Federal Aid Roads show the percent poor has decreased and the percent good and fair has increased. We need to make sure we give a clear explanation on why there are vast differences. We could take the historical modals and use the ones that we already have

done and have a calibration done to predict what will happen in 2018. Our forecasting modal will always lag behind what is actually happening. Especially when big changes such as funding are made.

T. Colling suggested taking the historical modal and using it to forecast what we already know. Then do the calibrations on them to predict what we know happened in 2018.

P. Kent analyzed previous forecasts future years' treatments may deteriorate more rapidly because agencies are doing minor fixes to the roads and not addressing structural deficiencies.

G. Chesbro presented the comparison graph of the regional rating team vs. the QR rating from the 2018 data collection. The ratings were very close, providing good confidence that our regional rating teams are collecting good data. The differences to the left of the axis were determined to be roads that were improved in the time between the team rating and the QR rating. J. Bauer of Rowe Engineering was present to answer any questions and provide observations of the QR data collection; J. Bauer advised she entered all the ratings and has taken Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) training on a regular basis.

G. Chesbro will provide all the data analysis with the forecast and text, including the break outs by National Functional Classification, that will go into the annual report at the March full Council meeting.

5. Review and Discussion Items:

5.1. – Establish Traffic Signal Survey/Inventory Pilot and Subject Matter Experts – D. Adelman

What can we use this inventory for in an asset management plan? MDOT's inventory was outdated so they did a lean process improvement where a team came together to help make a new asset management plan for traffic signals. They began the process of identifying which elements of signals and their infrastructure, they want to collect data on.

And there are many questions that need to be answered.

M. Toth reminded everyone about the Model Inventory Road Elements – Fundamental Data Elements (MIRE FDE), which is part of the transportation performance measure. They will be looking at the intersection junction traffic control. They currently have a list of 12 minimum items that they will be asking for by 2026. Roadsoft has already been set up to collect some data in their intersection junction field. MDOT is the biggest owner of traffic signal data. RCOC may be second and then possibly Grand Rapids, Michigan. RCOC and MDOT data are separate. There is a lot of overlap in the data that they both collect.

R. Jones and A. Verhelle, from the Road Commission of Oakland County, gave an overview of how and what they collect for their traffic signals. They had a list of 33 items that they collect related to traffic signals. They currently use a Web-based system. However, it is too cumbersome. They will be moving into a GIS based data system. When someone puts in a new signal, they complete a form that collects all the pertinent information that will be uploaded to the system.

What should TAMC do next? J. Start will talk to MTPA and get some ideas from them on what they deem important data to collect. The minimum information RCOC and MDOT would want on their system is: what the device is, what type of box/diagonal span, are they led or incandescent bulbs, are they count down heads for the pedestrian signals, what kind of controller do you have, do you have detection – a loop camera? Is it left turn? Is it flashing red to turn left? How old is it? Diagonal span and box span. Pole type information and number of anchor bolts. They need to come up with a rating system. If you have two signals close together, do they have one controller or two, and are they in the same jurisdiction or different jurisdictions? How will this data help other agencies? MDOT and RCOC will pull a list together for TAMC.

B. McEntee suggested to have a subject matter expert meeting to go over a finer level of details. This may be a good time to compare notes with the road commissions. He will set up a meeting in the next month or so.

Action Item: B. McEntee will work with support staff to set up an expert subject matter meeting.

5.2. – County Road Association Data Request B. McEntee/R. Belknap (Attachment 3)

This is a partner request. CSS feels that at first glance, it is easy to provide the requested information. If CSS only provides 2017 data that will only account for 50% of the information. They normally have 2016/2017 data because of the different fiscal years. CSS would like support staff to contact CRA and double check their request then inform CSS of the outcome and they will then provide the data.

Action Item: Support staff will contact CRA and double check their request. This information will then be provided to CSS to provide the data request.

5.3. –Update on Paving Warranties and the TAMC IRT – B. McEntee/C. Granger

Currently, the IRT collects a small amount of warranty information. TAMC support staff worked with County Road Association (CRA) to develop a warranty compliance report that will contain all the necessary information in the IRT report. In order to capture all pertinent warranty information, it was decided to add some additional questions in the IRT. CSS provided an estimate of these costs and other requested tasks from TAMC in their Estimates for Proposed Work 2/19/19 document that was shared with the committee. Their estimated cost for the warranty task is \$10,200. This money is already available in the current CSS budget and will not affect the current budget. Data Committee would like something workable by late June. It is estimated to take 122 hours to complete this task. MDOT Finance will be working to redesign the Act 51 Distribution and Reporting System (ADARS) in FY 2020. It will need to be discussed who will be responsible for paying for this. TAMC may not be responsible for costs related to IRT changes as a result of the ADARS redevelopment.

5.4. – 2017 Draft Reported Investments for TAMC Annual Report – B. McEntee

Because TAMC is now under the MIC, we may need to have a new process for distributing the annual report.

5.5. – Investment Reporting Compliance Review Update – R. Belknap

R. Belknap provided updates on the investment reporting compliance; many agencies are forgetting to update their Road and Bridge reporting status.

5.6. – Investment Reporting: Review Process of Future Projects and Three-year Plan Requirements – J. Start/B. McEntee

Currently, TAMC does not have a way to find out if agencies are compliant with posting their future projects and three-year plan future projects. In the future, TAMC agencies will need to coordinate road projects with water/sewer and other agencies' infrastructure projects. TAMC will need to find a way to collect this information and possibly share the projects on a map, particularly large projects, so all affected agencies have access to this information. CSS plans to begin making this map view by county within the IRT and create a report and update the user interface. The estimated cost for this project is \$7,200. These monies are already available in the current budget and will not affect TAMC's current budget and will not affect other work that CSS is doing.

Adding the culvert data to the IRT would be the next project that CSS would work on. CSS would need to use approximately 230 hours (\$23,000/\$100 an hour) to complete the requested task of integrating the culvert data into an interactive map and dashboard from the IRT.

It was also requested that CSS add to all dashboards the MPO layer where applicable. There would be only one phase to this project at an estimated cost of \$3,200.

5.7. –Work Program: Target Estimated Costs/Priorities by April – R. Belknap

CSS does not know where the funds would come from if monies are needed to place something in the IRT for asset management plans. This may need to be placed in the FY 2020 budget. R. Belknap will contact CSS if anything more needs to be done in this fiscal year.

5.8. – Website/Dashboard/IRT Update – CSS

This item was tabled until the next Data Committee meeting.

6. Public Comments:

T. Colling suggested TAMC hold a meeting with the CRA warranty committee at the CRA Highway Conference in March to discuss the local agency warranty program and the functionality that they will need from the IRT to track and report pavement warranties to meet state requirements.

7. Member Comments:

None

8. Adjournment:

Motion: B. Slattery made a motion to adjourn the meeting; J. Start seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.. The next meeting is scheduled for March 20, 2019, at 1:00 p.m., MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, 2700 Port Lansing Road, Lansing.

TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:	
AASHTO	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
ACE	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)
ACT-51	PUBLIC ACT 51 OF 1951-DEFINITION: A CLASSIFICATION SYTEM DESIGNED TO DISTRIBUTE MICHIGAN'S ACT 51 FUNDS. A ROADWAY MUST BE CLASSIFIED ON THE ACT 51 LIST TO RECEIVE STATE MONEY.
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
CPM	CAPITAL PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
CRA	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)
CSD	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)
CSS	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
ESC	EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE
FAST	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FOD	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)
FY	FISCAL YEAR
GLS REGION V	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
GVMC	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL
HPMS	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
IBR	INVENTORY BASED RATING
IRI	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX
IRT	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL
KATS	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
KCRC	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION

LDC	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS
LTAP	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
MAC	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
MAP-21	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21 ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MIC	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE COUNCIL
MITA	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
MML	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MPO	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MTA	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION
MTF	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
MTPA	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION
MTU	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
NBI	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY
NBIS	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS
NFA	NON-FEDERAL AID
NFC	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
PASER	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING
PNFA	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID
PWA	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
QA/QC	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
ROW	RIGHT-OF-WAY
RPA	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SEMCOG	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STC	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STP	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TAMC	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
TAMCSD	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM
WAMC	WATER ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.11.2018.GMS